

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-25 remain in the application with claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21-25 having been amended hereby and claim 3 having been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer.

As previously described, the present invention relates to an information processing method and apparatus that processes a transmission message among a plurality of sites connected by a network and includes a message reception unit that receives the message to execute predetermined pieces of reception processing. A rule accumulation unit accumulates the plurality of rules for use in executing message processing. A message conversion unit executes message conversion processing according to the plurality of rules that were previously accumulated. A message transmission unit executes transmission processing of the converted message that is then distributed among the plurality of traders at the plurality of sites. A feature of the present invention can be generally stated as analyzing the contents of the message so as to carry out the protocol conversion or sorting according to the analyzed result. Thus, as explained at page 44 and as shown in Fig. 3A, the data conversion processing that is to be applied is determined by the business rules according to the analyzed results of the main message body. That is, the entire message is analyzed.

The claims have been amended hereby to emphasize this feature of the present invention relating to the message conversion into a prescribed format according to a transmission origin of the message and the contents of the message.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19, and 21-25 under 35 USC 102(e), as being anticipated by Owens et al.

Owens et al. relates to a communication system that is intended to seamlessly integrate the different systems such as e-mail, voicemail, and fax communication systems to allow access to all communication systems from a single access point.

It is respectfully submitted that Owens et al. fails to show or suggest the feature of the present invention in which the contents of the message is analyzed so as to carry out the protocol conversion or sorting based on the results of such analysis as taught by the present invention and as positively recited in the claims.

Owens et al. does not describe this feature because in Owens et al. only the formats of the data themselves are checked and the conversion is carried out in response to the determination of such a format. It is respectfully submitted that determining the format is not the same as analyzing the contents of the message as in the presently claimed invention.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention is not anticipated by Owens et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 6, 13, and 20 under 35 USC 103, as being unpatentable over Owens et al. in view of Matsuo.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15 respectively, which independent claims are thought to be patentably distinct over the cited reference.

Matsuo is cited for teaching encryption for automatic message processing using rules. Nevertheless, Matsuo does not cure the deficiency of Owens et al. relating to performing a protocol conversion based on an analysis of the contents of the message, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims.

Therefore, by reason of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that an information processing method and apparatus as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims is neither shown nor suggested in the cited references, alone or in combination.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited and it is respectfully submitted that this amendment raises no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search since the

independent claims have been amended to essentially recite the feature previously set forth in claim 3, which had been already considered.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jay H. Maioli".

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:tb